DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 580 CS 211 549

AUTHOR Potter, Ellen F.; And Others
TITLE Criteria Children Use To Evaluate Their Own and Others' Writing.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987). Project partially supported by a grant from the University of South Carolina Research and Productive Scholarship Fund.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Grade 5; Intermediate Grades; Middle Schools; *Peer Evaluation; Revision (Written Composition); Student Writing Models; Writing Difficulties; *Writing Evaluation; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS *Writing Achievement

ABSTRACT

Research suggests that students make judgments about writing at a very early age, but their interpretations of what makes writing good or bad differs in important ways from those of teachers or professional writers. An understanding of how children's evaluative criteria develop is critical to teachers in helping children become better writers. Subjects, 27 fifth graders attending a largely rural middle school in the southeast, were divided into low and high achievers according to their reading scores, interviewed individually, asked to comment on their own writing and constructed texts, told to rank the stories, and then were asked a series of open-ended questions designed to elicit evaluative comments about each story. Preliminary data analysis revealed (1) that there is some evidence that the low-achieving fifth graders exhibited responses similar to those observed in younger students and in novice student writers of all ages; (2) that low achieving students tended to use more personal associations and surface features as evaluative criteria than the high achievers; (3) that low achievers tended not to respond to the craft dimension in their rankings of texts whereas high achievers did distinguish between texts as a result of the craft manipulation; and (4) that low achieving students were especially more likely to apply "objective" text-based criteria to other's writing than to their own. (Three tables of data are included, and 14 references and three appendixes containing constructed stories, a structured interview example, and a category system glossary, are attached.) (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ellen F. Potter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED299580

Criteria Children Use to Evaluate Their Own And Others' Writing

Ellen F. Potter Beverly A. Busching Christine B. McCormick

Virdean Wilkes Betty Ann Slesinger

University of South Carolina

Paper presented at the 1987 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.
April, 1987

CS211549

This research was partially supported by a grant from the University of South Carolina Research and Productive Scholarship Fund.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The process of evaluation pervades the teaching and learning of writing. Teachers search for ways to formulate and communicate evaluations that are useful in fostering the development of children as writers. Children who are making decisions about their writing and trying to become better writers seek to understand what "better" writing means. In turn, teachers monitor student evaluations as one indication of growth in understanding of writing. Research suggests (Calkins, 1980; Graves, 1982; Miller, 1982; Newkirk, 1982) that students make judgements about writing at a very early age, but their interpretations of what makes writing good or bad differs in important ways from those of teachers or professional writers. An understanding of how children's evaluative criteria develop is critical to teachers in helping children become better writers.

Research indicates that students' evaluation of writing evolves, not as a linear function of time, but as a complex pattern of responses to influences such as maturation, experience, instruction, and audience. Young writers have been found, for example, to have difficulty revising their own work, despite efforts of teachers of writing at all levels of schooling to provide instruction regarding critical dimensions of written products. It has been suggested that student problems with revision may be in part due to lack of ability to evaluate their own writing (Beach, 1976; Scardamalia & Bereiter, 1983). Graves, Calkins and other observers of student writers at work in classrooms have noted the close relationship of growth in ability to verbalize criteria for writing and students' growing composing abilities.

The present study builds upon the work of other researchers who have investigated children's evaluation of writing. Applebee (1978) established that developmental trends exist in the way children approach the evaluation of stories typically found in school materials. In this view, children progress from initial global reactions to text content to a finer grained analysis of larger understandings gained from text. Similarly, Newkirk's (1982) analysis of transcripts of writing conferences and interviews suggested a progression from protocritical judgements (based on elements embedded in or associated with text, such as drawings, handwriting, or associated experiences) to critical judgements (based on qualities of text itself). Only in the critical stage did children see the text as an autonomous entity to which one might apply evaluative criteria.

Additional dimensions of children's evaluations were noted by Hilgers (1984; 1986) whose research methodology included interviews and case study approaches. Consistent with Applebee and Newkirk, Hilgers suggests that children evaluate using criteria that include affective reactions to text, text surface features, ease of understanding text, craftsmanship evident in text, and value of text. Other researchers (Graves, 1982; Calkins, 1986) have noted the ways that form and content compete for the focus of children's evaluations, partly as a result of situational influences. In addition, the occasional emergence of consideration of audience as criteria has been noted.

The present study builds largely on Hilgers' work, but extends it through the use of more carefully controlled

procedures and a larger sample size. In addition, students in the present study were selected to represent various achievement levels. As in Hilgers' (1984;1986) research, students were asked to evaluate not only their own texts but texts created by "others" so that differences in evaluative criteria resulting from origin of text could be examined. In this study, however, the "other" texts were constructed to vary along the dimensions of interest level and craftsmanship. From transcripts of student interviews, we have attempted to construct a category system to describe responses to writing which is more comprehensive and more sensitive to subtle differences in children's responses than systems which have been previously described.

Method.

Subjects. The students were 27 fifth graders, 12 boys and 15 girls, attending a largely rural middle school in the southeast. Students were classified according to their reading scores on the California Test of Basic Skills, which they had taken the previous spring. This paper reports only the responses of the eleven low achievers (deciles 0, 1, or 2) and the ten high achievers (deciles 7, 8, or 9). No children with identified learning disabilities or other special characteristics, such as English as a second language, were included.

All of the students were taught writing for a class period each day by the same teacher who emphasized steps in the process of writing, peer and teacher responses to drafts, and discussion of the qualities of good writing. The low achieving students, in addition, were part of a special language arts/reading program based on reading and writing about student-selected childrens'

literature. The high achieving students had experienced one previous year of process writing instruction; the low achieving students had little previous experience with composing.

Materials. Four pieces of writing were constructed by the researchers to vary along dimensions of topic interest and quality of writing based on samples of fourth and fifth grade writing. Features of the text were manipulated to create the following intersections of these dimensions: high topic/high craft, high topic/low craft, low topic/high craft, low topic/low craft.

The dimension of topic interest level was manipulated according to the following procedure. Eight possible topics were pretested for interest level by questioning a group of 24 children, aged 6 through 11, who attended an afterschool program. Children were asked to rate each topic on a five point Likert scale (1 = really boring, 2 = a little boring, 3 = okay, 4 = interesting, and 5 = very interesting.) The highest rated topics, chosen for the high interest topic stories, were A Terrible Snake (rated 3.0) and Space Adventure (rated 3.58). The lowest interest topics were School (1.66) and Shopping with My Mother (2.46). The title "Waiting While My Mother Shops" was substituted for Shopping With My Mother" in order to make the topic seem even less interesting. It should be noted that although there were clear, and statistically significant, differences in the interest levels of the topics, each of the eight topics elicited at least one rating of "really boring" and one rating of "very interesting" which indicates the importance

of individual differences among children in what they find interesting.

Five features desirable in written compositions of adults and students (Murray, 1968; Calkins, 1986) were incorporated in the constructed texts to represent high levels of the dimension of craft. Information (variously called detail or elaboration) was represented positively by sentences, phrases and words such as "long, brown body" and "back porch". Style (voice) was represented by including conversation, exclamations, and high interest experessions such as "My grandma is the greatest!" Precise language was represented by the use of specific verbs and nouns such as "wriggle" and "coconut". Clarity, including organization and smooth flow from idea to idea, was represented by pretesting stories on children and reading specialists to insure that meaning was complete. Story Structure was represented by providing an adequate introduction at the beginning of the story and a resolution at the end. On the other hand, the two Low Craft texts had vague, ordinary language, were almost devoid of detail, and had serious interruptions of meaning as well as incomplete story structure.

All constructed texts were uniform in length and were pretested on third, fourth, and fifth grade students for readability. Of six college teachers and four elementary teachers who ranked the texts, all rated the High Craft texts as better than the Low Craft texts. See Appendix A for copies of the constructed stories.

In addition, two to four pieces of the student's own writing were selected from relatively finished fictional or non-fiction

writing, excluding letters, poetry and other special forms. Only two students provided as few as two stories.

Procedure. The students were interviewed individually in a quiet location, after opportunitites to become acquainted with the four interviewers in informal classroom conversations. One half of the students were asked to comment on their own writing first (Own), then the constructed texts (Other), with the reverse procedure for the remaining students. They were asked to read all four stories aloud, to insure that they were acquainted with the text, then to rank the stories from best to last. Once the stories had been ranked, the students were asked a series of open-ended questions designed to elicit evaluative comments about each story. The wording of certain interview questions and the general sequence of questions were uniform. For example, the first question for each story would be something like "Now, tell me about this one. Why was it first (next) (last)?" and the last would be "Is there anything else you want to say about this one?". (See Appendix B for an outline of the structured interview procedure).

Each interviewer trained to become comfortable with the wording and sequence of questions in the structured interview. These interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. The accuracy of each transcription was verified by a second researcher. The interviewers observed that the task engaged the students' involvement: even students whose verbalizations were meager exhibited signs of involvement (e.g., smiling, looking carefully over the stories, spontaneous comments about writing).

Analysis.

Student comments were first segmented into separate idea units expressing single criteria. Because the decisions about where segments began and ended were to some extent judgmental, forced agreement between pairs of readers were used.

The analysis procedures used in this study were guided by Glaser and Strauss' (1967) constant comparative method of data analysis. Initial categories were developed from a subsample of the data, then tested on other transcripts and refined. In this way, categories were developed and cycled back to the data for further testing. Additional means of restricting bias in qualitative research suggested by Mehan (1979) were incorporated into the procedures: retreivability of data (audio recordings and transcripts), comprehensive data treatment (all recorded instances of like behaviors were taken into account), and convergence of multiple perspectives (the varied backgrounds of the researchers represented the perspectives of teachers of English at different levels, developmental and cognitive psychologists, and graduate students in language arts and educational research).

In the final step of classifying student responses, the total of 431 evaluative statments were categorized separately by five judges. For 84% of these statements, the judges readily agreed on the main category of evaluative criteria. For 16% of the statements, disagreements were resolved by discussion.

Results.

Category System. In Table 1, the category system for evaluative criteria developed through the above described process

is presented. The category system includes five major kinds of criteria that students use to judge written texts (in addition to a "not interpretable" designation). The major categories of critera are Topic (focusing on the subject of text), Text (focusing on aspects of the text itself), Association (noting aspects from one's own life that are suggested by text), Process (focusing on events in the creation and sharing of text), and Surface Qualities (focusing on the image of the text on paper or language correctness). Each major category includes a variety of subcategories, which represent important differences in student response. For example, the category Topic includes a General sub-category for a response which gives only a generalized personal preference for the topic. It also includes sub-categories for more descriptive responses which refer to topics as being Interesting or Important. A Glossary which defines the categories and gives examples is presented in Appendix C.

Although much of our category system is similar to categories described by previous researchers, this system includes additional categories which enables us to reflect more sensitively the full range of variation in student responses. Under Association, for example, students' responses citing events that occurred to them (Personal Experience) are differentiated from events remembered from secondary sources such as television or books (Non Personal Events). Under Process, student statements are further categorized into four significantly different response types. For example, some students focused on the amount of effort expended on the piece of writing (Effort) as

the basis for their evaluation. Very different Process responses focused on real or imagined reactions of teachers or peers (Audience Reaction) or on the stages of composition from prewriting to presentation to an audience (Steps in Process). Another important kind of Process response, in which students couched their evaluations in terms of their typical writing practices or the evolution of their skills, was placed in the category Self as Writer.

The most extensive of the major categories is Text, which includes reponses which focus on the text itself. The use of this category differs from previous category systems in that all Text responses are further classified as either "Text as Understood" (in which the student responds as a reader, usually referring to the text as "it"), or "Text as Produced" (in which an author of the text is mentioned or strongly implied). This distinction was created in order to explore an important dimension of a students' sense of self as a writer, an awareness of the author's careful choices in creating text.

It should be noted that Text includes categories reflecting a range of sophistication of text-based responses, from "Repeats Parts" (with no actual evaluative statements given) to verbalized assessments of text features (Features to Create Interest). Other text-based subcategories describe responses which noted the level of information present (Information), ways in which the text made sense or failed to make sense (Makes Sense), and whether the text was or was not based on reality (Reality). (Descriptions of other sub-categories of Text can be found in the glossary.)

Students' Use of Criteria. Table 2 indicates the mean number of responses the students gave for each major category of evaluative response (Topic, Text, Association, Process, and Surface.) Although no statistical analyses have yet been completed, systematic patterns due to the text manipulation (Own vs. Other) and the ability variable (High vs. Low) appear to emerge.

The mean total number of evaluative responses produced by the Low Achievers (7.57) was very similar to that produced by the High Achievers (8.25). Likewise, the mean total number of evaluative responses elicited by Own stories (7.86) was similar to that elicited by the Other stories (7.71).

Overall, Text was the most frequently used evaluative response category, with 67% of all evaluative responses classifed in that category (See Table 3). Although Low and High Achievers gave similar percentages of Text-based responses to the Other stories (78% vs 80%), on stories written by themselves (Own) Low Achievers were less likely to note text based criteria than the High Achievers (44% vs 64%).

The use of Association criteria was virtually restricted to Low Achievers discussing their own stories. The High Achievers exhibited a greater percentage of Process comments than Low Achievers (15% vs 6%). As expected, for both ability groups, more Process comments were elicited by Own stories.

On the whole, few evaluative comments (only 6%) focused on Surface criteria and many of these were produced by Low Achievers who were discussing their own pieces of writing. This may be a

reflection of the greater number of surface problems in the writing of low achieving students. Also, it must be kept in mind that very few surface errors appeared in the constructed texts. Finally, Topic considerations were of moderate interest to both groups of students on both types of stories.

Rankings of "Other" Stories. Students designated each of the constructed stories as being the best, next best, third best and worst. These rankings were assigned numerical values of 1, 2, 3 or 4, respectively. The mean ranking of each story in both ability groups was computed to assess the extent to which student rankings were associated with the two manipulated text variables, craft and topic. A set of four apriori planned contrasts was conducted on this ranking measure. Specifically, four pairwise comparisons were made between the mean rankings of each of the four stories by the ability groups. Each contrast was tested using $\alpha = .0125$, resulting in a family wise Type I error rate of $\leq .05$ for the set. In this analysis, Low Achievers rated the Low Topic/Low Craft story (entitled "School") significantly higher than the High Achievers. No other differences in rankings were significant.

In a supplementary analysis, the combined mean rankings for both High Craft stories ("A Terrible Snake" and "Waiting While My Mother Shops") and the combined mean rankings for both Low Craft stories ("School" and "Space Adventure") were computed. Likewise, the combined mean rankings for both High Topic stories ("A Terrible Snake" and "Space") and the combined mean rankings for both Low Topic stories ("School" and "Wating While My Mother Shops") were computed. Another set of four apriori planned

contrasts was conducted on this ranking measure. Specifically, within each ability group, the mean rankings of the High Craft stories was compared to the rankings of the Low Craft stories. Likewise, the mean rankings of the High Topic stories were compared to the rankings of the Low Topic stories. In this analysis, High Achievers ranked High Craft stories ($\bar{X}$ = 1.75) higher than Low Craft stories ($\bar{X}$ = 3.25). No other significant differences were detected.

DISCUSSION.

In this preliminary data analysis, there is some evidence that the low achieving fifth graders exhibited responses similar to those that have been observed in younger students (Hilgers, 1986; Newkirk, 1982) and in novice student writers of all ages (Graves, 1983; Calkins, 1986). For example, these students tended to use more personal associations and surface features as evaluative criteria than the high achievers. Moreover, as indicated by the mean rankings of the constructed texts, low achievers tended not to respond to the craft dimension in their rankings of texts whereas high achievers did distinguish between texts as a result of the craft manipulation.

Differences between criteria used to evaluate Own vs. Other's texts appear to be partly attributable to the fact that associations and memories about events in the writing process were more accessible to students when they read their own texts than when they read the constructed texts. It also appeared that low achieving students were especially more likely to apply "objective" text based criteria to other's writing than to their

own. It should be noted that the preliminary results reported in this paper (mean responses in six major categories) may mask extensive differences in evaluative criteria that exist between high and low achievers. For example, as reported here, although both high and low achievers gave similar numbers of text-based comments, the kind of text-based comments characteristic of each group was very different. Most of the low achievers' text comments were limited to either repeating parts of the text without further comment or commenting on information provided or lacking, while high achievers gave a widely ranging assortment of comments on introductions, word choice, style and plot structure. In the more fine grained data analysis to be completed potential differences in the use of these subcategories (and in the Text as Produced vs. Understood distinction) will be described.

Additional data, such as teacher rankings of the texts and both teacher and student rankings of important dimensions of good writing, have been collected and will likely add to a more complete picture of student concepts of good writing. Using the entire corpus of available data, including qualitative analysis of interview transcripts, individual profiles of students will be explored. Informal examination of the transcripts indicates that fourteen students did not include any "Process" responses; six students depended merely on repeating parts of the text for almost all of their comments; and twenty-three students gave multiple text-based criteria.

There are many interesting questions to explore in the qualitative examination of transcripts. For example, is there a basis for designating a label of "less mature" to the overall

response pattern of some students? Or from a different perspective, did some of the constructed texts tend to stimulate similar kinds of criteria across students?

Answers to some questions will await the collection of more data. It was interesting to observe that low achievers tackled the experimental task readily and with confidence, gave as many responses as the high achievers, and were able to address text characteristics rather extensively (though not as thoroughly as the high achievers). The fact that these low achievers had been immersed for six months in a workshop approach to reading and writing may have accounted for their ability to evaluate texts. This and other hypotheses about the relationship between evaluative responses and instruction will be explored through comparisons with other low achieving student samples. Questions about the development of writing skills will be explored in a followup study currently being conducted. In this way, we hope to build a more complete understanding of students' mental processes as they write, revise and reflect on writing in many different situations.

References

Applebee, A. N. (1978). The child's concept of story: Ages two to seventeen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Beach, R. (1976). Self-evaluation strategies of extensive revisers and nonrevisers. College Composition and Communication, 27, 160-164.

Calkins, L. (1980). Children's rewriting strategies. Research in the Teaching of English, 14, 331-341.

Calkins, L. (1986). The art of teaching writing. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Graves, D. H. (1982) How do writers develop? Language Arts, 59, 173-179.

Graves, D.H. (1983). Writing: Teachers and children at work. Exeter, N.H.: Heinemann.

Hilgers, T. H. (1984). Toward a taxonomy of beginning writers' evaluative statements on written compositions. Written Communication, 1, 365-384.

Hilgers, T.H. (1986). How children change as critical evaluators of writing : Four three-year case studies. Research in the Teaching of English, 20, 36-55.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning Lessons. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Miller, S. (1982). How writers evaluate their own writing. College Composition and Communication, 33, 176-183.

Murray, D. M. (1968). A writer teaches writing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Newkirk, T. (1982). Young writers as critical readers. Language Arts, 59, 451-457.

Scardamalia, M. and Bereiter, C. (1983). The development of evaluative, diagnostic, and remedial capabilities in children's composing. In M. Martlew (Ed.), The psychology of written language: Developmental and educational perspectives (pp.67-95). New York: John Wiley.

TABLE I CATEGORIES OF STUDENT EVALUATIVE RESPONSES

TOPIC
- GENERAL
- IMPORTANCE
- INTEREST LEVEL
- OTHER

TEXT*
- GENERAL
- REPEATS PARTS
- AGE APPROPRIATENESS
- MORAL LESSON
- INFORMATION
  - General
  - Elaboration
  - Reasons
  - Other
- MAKES SENSE
  - General
  - Clarity
  - Repetitiveness
  - Relevance
  - Organization
  - Other
- FEATURES TO CREATE INTEREST
  - General
  - Creativity
  - Emotions
  - Humor
  - Action
  - Characterization
  - Style
  - Other
- REALITY
  - General
  - Credibility
  - Real Life
  - Other
- IDENTIFICATION
- LITERARY FEATURES
  - Plot
  - Characters
  - Forms/Genres
  - Matches Requirement
  - Other
- LANGUAGE FEATURES
  - Word Choice
  - Sentences and Paragraphs
  - Other
- OTHER

ASSOCIATION
- GENERAL
- PERSONAL EXPERIENCE
- NON PERSONAL EVENTS
- OTHER

PROCESS
- GENERAL
- EFFORT
- AUDIENCE REACTION
- STEPS IN PROCESS
- SELF AS WRITER
- OTHER

SURFACE QUALITIES
- GENERAL
- NEATNESS
- SPACING
- HANDWRITING
- MECHANICS
- USAGE
- LENGTH
- ART WORK
- OTHER

NOT INTERPRETABLE

*All **TEXT** responses are categorized as either As Understood or As Produced.

Table 2 - Mean Number of Evaluative Responses by Category for Type of Text and Student Achievement Level

Own Text's

	Low Achievers (n = 11)		High Achievers (n = 10)		Total (n = 21)	
	Mean	(S.D.)	Mean	(S.D.)	Mean	(S.D.)
Category						
Topic	.27	(.47)	.40	(.51)	.33	(.48)
Text	3.18	(1.84)	5.40	(2.12)	4.23	(2.26)
Association	1.19	(1.30)	0	(0)	1.00	(1.34)
Process	.82	(.98)	1.70	(1.57)	1.24	(1.34)
Surface	1.00	(1.61)	.60	(.70)	.81	(1.25)
Total* Number of Responses	7.27	(2.90)	8.50	(3.03)	7.86	(2.95)

Others' Texts

	Low Achievers (n = 11)		High Achievers (n = 10)		Total (n = 21)	
	Mean	(S.D.)	Mean	(S.D.)	Mean	(S.D.)
Category						
Topic	.91	(.70)	.60	(1.07)	.76	(.89)
Text	5.82	(2.60)	6.40	(3.10)	6.09	(2.79)
Association	.27	(.47)	.10	(.32)	.19	(.40)
Process	.09	(.30)	.70	(1.06)	.38	(.80)
Surface	.27	(.47)	.10	(.32)	.19	(.40)
Total* Number of Responses	7.45	(2.34)	8.00	(2.67)	7.71	(2.45)

*Total includes Not-Interpretable responses.

Table 3 - Percentage of Evaluative Responses By Category for Type of Text and Student Achievement Level

Own Texts

	Low Achievers (n = 11)	High Achievers (n = 10)	Total (n = 21)
Category			
Topic	.04	.05	.04
Text	.44	.64	.54
Association	.26	0	.13
Process	.11	.20	.16
Surface	.14	.07	.10
Total* Number of Responses	.99	.96	.97

Others' Texts

	Low Achievers (n = 11)	High Achievers (n = 10)	Total (n = 21)
Category			
Topic	.12	.08	.10
Text	.78	.80	.79
Association	.04	.01	.02
Process	.01	.09	.05
Surface	.04	.01	.02
Total* Number of Responses	.99	.99	.98

* Total does not equal 100% because the Not-Interpretable responses are not included in categories.

APPENDIX A: CONSTRUCTED STORIES

A TERRIBLE SNAKE

When I was five years old, my grandma chopped off the head of a snake with a hoe. She saved my life! I was walking up to the back porch when I saw the terrible snake right in front of me. It hissed. "Help! Help!" I called. Grandma came running. When she saw the big snake, she took the hoe and chopped its head right off. I was shaking and crying because I was so scared. Grandma hugged me, and we watched the snake's long brown body wiggle on the ground. My grandma is the greatest.

SCHOOL

You need books, pencils, and other supplies and other things. I am not late to school because I always get ready on time. I am always on time for school. School is nice for learning all the things. It has six grades, and then you go to another school. Children learn about what you need in life, like things you need to know in reading and in math. I am good in math, and I get good grades. I had a good paper today. My sister has good papers, too.

WAITING WHILE MY MOTHER SHOPS

When my mother takes me to the furniture store with her, I pretend that I can buy anything in the store. I look for furniture for my room. Last time I found a blue velvet chair with big fluffy pillows. "This is like sitting on a cloud," I said, as I sank into the soft chair. Then I saw a crazy lamp. The light bulb was a coconut. Two monkeys climbed up to get it. "What a crazy lamp!" Just then I heard my mom calling, "Get over here. We're going to look at tables now." I didn't want TO do it, but sometimes you have to do what your mother says.

SPACE ADVENTURE

I'm going into space. Whoom! I can go far. I went out in space on the space ship. There are lots of places to go in space, and we went very far past many stars. He was a big creature, and he was in space, too. The space ship was great. I know how to go into space. You go in the ship out in space. I saw stars and galaxies as we flew. The stars were very nice to see and interesting. I liked the stars. I saw stars on T.V. They were nice.

APPENDIX B - OUTLINE OF STRUCTURED INTERVIEW
(Version 1 - Other/Own)

INTRO

- We're talking to children about good writing.

- Having a good time - Interesting to find out what children have to say about good writing.

-Today, I'd like to find out what you think about some pieces of writing, what your opinion is

- No right or wrong answers - Interested in your ideas.

OTHER'S WRITING

I have some pieces of writing by another student here. My friend who is a teacher in another school gave them to me. They are some short pieces by a 4th grader, I think. Here they are.

I'd like you to take some time to read them - Why don't you just read them out loud - I'll help with the hard words - Start with the title.

So there are the 4 pieces of writing. I'd like you to look at and think about these pieces of writing for awhile and think about which you think is the best piece of writing. And put them in order from the best one to the last one. So, of these 4, pick out the best one, and put it first. And then the next....like that.
O.K., begin. (Cue)

So there is the order , what you decided

#1 - Well let's look at these. I was wondering why you picked this one as best?
(What makes it so good?
What makes this one better than the others?)

(I'm not sure what you mean by.....
Could you tell me more about what you mean by.....?
Tell me more about its being.....
Look back at it carefully - can you say just what things in the piece make it .....)

Is there anything else you want to say about this one?

#2 Let's talk about this piece. Why is this one #2?
(Why is this one next?)

Is there anything else you want to say about this one?

#4 Let's talk about this piece. Why is this one #4?
Why is this one last?

Is there anything else you want to say about this one?

OWN WRITING

Now, here are __ short pieces of your writing that Mr./Mrs._____ gave me. Remember these? (Put writing on table.)

Would you take some time to read these aloud to me so we can talk about them? (Cue) Start with the title.

You're done? (Cue)

I'd like for you to look at and think about your pieces of writing for awhile, and just like you did before, think about which you think is the best piece of writing. Put them in order from the best one to the last one. So, of these ___, pick out the best one, and put it first. And then the next....like that.
O.K., begin. (Cue)

Well, so that's the order....what you decided

#1 - Well let's look at these. I was wondering why you picked this one as best?
(What makes it so good?
What makes this one better than the others?)

(I'm not sure what you mean by.....
Could you tell me more about what you mean by.....?
Tell me more about its being.....
Look back at it carefully - can you say just what things in the piece make it .....)

Is there anything else you want to say about this one?

#2 Let's talk about this piece. Why is this one #2?

Is there anything else you want to say about this one?

#4 (#3?) Let's talk about this piece. Why is this one #4 (#3)?

Is there anything else you want to say about this one?

OK, thanks for talking to me about your writing, I enjoyed hearing what you had to say

Is there anything you'd like to say about our talk, any questions?

Thank you very much - you've helped me understand about writing
Could I come talk to you again if I have some more questions?

APPENDIX C

CATEGORY SYSTEM GLOSSARY

NOT INTERPRETABLE

The student's statement doesn't give enough information to understand the category applied (differs from OTHER in that OTHER expresses a category not on the list).

JUWA: 1.4.14 -- I thought so (uh). For - for something that short (uh). I don't know (uh). I can think about it, yeah.

TAWI: 1.2.4 -- and Ms. L (teacher) told us to write it so...

TOPIC

The student refers to the subject or topic of the text but not to events, characters, or other specific features of the text.

GENERAL -- The student states only general feeling tone or preference for the topic of the text (e.g., I like school; I don't like snakes.)

JOMY: 2.1.1 -- I just like learning things about school and school is my favorite subject you know

JAJO: 2.4.5 -- 'Cause I'm not crazy about space.

IMPORTANCE -- The student cites the topic of the text for its importance. (e.g., School is an important subject; My bicycle isn't that important to write about.)

SHHA: 2.1.1 -- Cuz school is very important.

LAJE: 1.2.3 -- Okay. (pause) A lot of people should know about it... (referring to a text about diabetes)

INTEREST LEVEL -- The student cites the subject of the text as being interesting or exciting or not interesting or not exciting. (e.g., School is boring; Snakes are interesting.)

OTHER -- The student cites qualities of the topic other than those specified as criteria.

TEXT

The student comments on characteristics, qualities, and content of the text itself (other than topic, or surface features). All text comments are first classified to indicate the responder's role as follows:

TEXT AS UNDERSTOOD -- The student describes the text from the point of view of the reader without mentioning or implying an author. These comments are frequently distinguished by the use of "it says" to refer to writing, rather than "he/she/they/I say(s)" (e.g., This story is interesting.)

TEXT AS PRODUCED -- The student's comment explicitly mentions or strongly implies an author at least one time within a total response unit. These comments are frequently distinguished by the use of "he/she/they/I say(s)" rather than "it says" (e.g., He (the author) made this story interesting.)

When authorship is not clearly stated or strongly implied, then use TEXT AS UNDERSTOOD as the default category.

In addition, TEXT references are classifed as:

GENERAL -- The student states only general feeling tone or preference for the text as a whole without reference to any specific text characteristics. (e.g., "I did a good job." "It's a good story." "I didn't like this story")

> JUWA: 1.1.3 -- I just like stories like that.
>
> AMJE: 1.1.3 -- and I think its the best.
>
> JOMY: 1.2.5 -- and that just isn't a very good story to me its all right but its not my favorite one.

REPEATS PARTS -- The student indicates preference for parts of the text, but does not offer any comment about why they have been selected for attention. The student merely repeats the text, either verbatim or in paraphrase.

> CHBR: 2.4.6 -- Um (long pause) I like the part where it says I am not late to school because I always get up on time (uh huh) and school is nice for learning all things and children learn about what you need in life like things you need to know in reading and math. (These ideas are all part of the text.)
>
> BEBR: 2.4.8 -- (I like the part where it says) ...I am not late to school because I always get ready on time and I'm always on time for school ...

AGE APPROPRIATENESS -- The student explicitly comments on the whole text or any part of the text based on whether it is appropriate for the author's (or the reader's) age, grade or ability level (e.g., Older kids wouldn't like this; First graders could understand this.)

MORAL(LESSON) -- The student comments on a moral or life lesson that can be learned from the text, whether the lesson is stated in the text or is inferred by the student (e.g., This story teaches us to be kind to our neighbors.)

> CACO: 1.4.4. -- it does show that it is bad for you to smoke and it is bad for your health and stuff ....

INFORMATION -- The student's comments focus on the sufficiency of information in the text. In some cases, these comments focus on the general adequacy of the information that is present in the text.

In order to be considered a negative comment (see NEGATIVE VALENCE), the student comments on information that is not present (and should be). If the student criticizes the information in the text based on its being too obvious or too dull, these comments are categorized as negative instances of FEATURES TO CREATE INTEREST.

GENERAL -- The student comments as to whether information is present or absent, or is good or bad with no reference to any specific characteristics or kinds of information. No other specific comments are made. These comments do not imply that the text is difficult to understand or does not make sense (see MAKES SENSE). (e.g: It tells a lot about him. All that it said wasn't good.)

> CHCH: 2.1.3 -- In this here it ain't got as much stuff ...

> JOMY: 2.1.2 -- It just, it tells more things about what the story is about.

ELABORATION (facts, description, details, dialogue) -- The student explicitly comments on whether certain kinds of information that elaborate on general ideas are present or adequate with the exception of reasoning as described in the REASONS category below (e.g., too much or not enough details, too much or not enough dialogue, too much or not enough descriptive words, etc.)

> BEBR: 2.1.1 -- I like, I like this one the best because it had a quote in it, and I like poems that have quotes in em or stories like that.

> CHBR: 2.3.9 -- I think this one has more details in it than

this one ...

ROGU: 1.4.8 -- um ...um ...cuz... I think that this one needs more details.

REASONS -- The student comments on whether or not reasons or explanations to support points are detailed in the text. The student's comments may elaborate on the quality of the reasons provided but not on whether the text makes sense (see MAKES SENSE).

VEDA: 2.2.6 -- the way she's explaining everything in her story, uh, and she's she didn't want to go with her mother but she has to obey her parents

OTHER -- Other specfic comments on the sufficiency of the information supplied in the text.

MAKES SENSE -- The student comments on whether or not the meaning of the text is disrupted or whether the text is easy or difficult to understand. The comments may describe why the text is easy or difficult to understand or which portions of the text cause disruptions in meaning. Although students seem most likely to notice when the meaning of the text has been disrupted, positive instances of this category are possible.

GENERAL -- The student comments on whether or not the text makes sense or not but does not explicitly comment on why or why not.

CHCH: 2.4.1 -- Space adventure wasn't right. It is something about it. It didn't sound right as you read it.

HEEN: 2.1.1 -- Cause it made the most sense.

CLARITY --The student comments that some portion of the text is difficult to understand because it is not clearly stated. Usually, the student goes on to describe where in the text meaning or understanding was disrupted.

SHHA: 2.4.5 -- I really didn't understand is cuz ... like um um he was a big cr- where it says um there are lots of places to go in space and we went very far past many stars he was a big creature. They don't tell when they seen the big creature and everything.

BEBR: 1.4.11 -- It... XXX it had too many people for one thing. There's Ricky and Sam and Christy and Darlene and his parents and the teacher and umh and it kind of loses you right there about the XXXX and everything, XXX you up,

JWFA: 2.3.9 -- and um ... he put something in there he was a big creature and it really didn't tell ... a creature was in there. It just said he was a big creature and nothing

else was in there.

REPETITIVENESS -- The student comments that the meaning of the text was disrupted by repetition within the text. This repetition is perceived as awkward or raises questions in the reader's mind. If the student indicates that the repetition makes the text boring then this comment would be classifed as a negative example of FEATURES TO CREATE INTEREST. If student indicates that the repetition is not as artistic way to present information, categorize under FEATURES TO CREAT INTEREST -- STYLE.

BEBR: 2.4.7 -- It repeats itself over and over again.

HEEN: 2.4.7 -- A lot of this said the same thing over again like it said "you need books, pencils, and other supplies and other things".

RELEVANCE -- The student comments that some portion of the text does not seem to belong or is not relevant to the rest of the text (e.g., This doesn't seem to fit in a story about whales.)

ORGANIZATION (order) -- Negative comments imply that the text is disorganized or that portions of the text are out of order.

STVA: 2.4.5 -- It talks about one thing and then goes to (another?) and then goes back to the other

JWFA: 2.2.5 -- and um ... (short pause) he didn't put the orders in quite the sequence that I really feel like that would sound better and um ... that is just about it you know on that one.

JWFA: 2.4.12 -- Um as I said he used school a lot and not ... all schools go up to sixth grade but we are not really talking about school grades and uh, he brought something in there about my sister has good papers too when it's mainly about school and it's about what goes on at that particular school and not what goes on with other stuff and so that made it come in fourth.

OTHER -- Other specific comments referring to disruption in meaning or understanding of the text.

FEATURES TO CREATE INTEREST -- The student comments or implies that the text is or is not interesting or describes qualities that are commonly assumed to create this interest.

GENERAL -- The student comments in a general way that the text is or is not interesting, but does not describe the specific features that create this interest.

JECL: 2.3.7 -- It's just ... it's just dull, it doesn't, you don't think, "xxx (exclamation) the pencil's all mine: what

next!"

JWFA: 2.1.2 -- and it was um kind of interesting and showed some things I would like to see and things like that and she showed a lot of interest in writing ... huh.

CREATIVITY (originality, imagination) -- The student comments that the text is creative, imaginative, fanciful, unusual or different from what is usually written. The student may go on to describe a portion of the passage that exhibits these qualities.

AMJE: 2.1.1 -- Because ... I like this one'n. Sometimes grandmama don't - you don't hardly ever see your grandma come running out the house and choppin off the head of a snake.

BEBR: 2.2.5 -- and its got some creative things in it like there like the light bulb with the coconut and the two monkeys climbed up to get the bulb.

EMOTIONS -- The student comments on the whole or any part of the text, explicitly referencing the fact that the text expresses human emotions.

BEBR: 2.1.2 -- and, and she uses, she shows her feelings like she was scared and she was crying and she tells how her grandmother saved her life and how she loves her grandmother for doing that. That's why I liked this one.

CACO: 1.1.2 -- and um ... I liked it because it showed caring for friends and um that it really did show that you meant what you were saying and I meant what I was saying in this story.

HUKA: 2.4.9 -- um its not expressing any feelings not many maybe ... one, I am good in math and that is about it.

HUMOR -- The student comments on the whole or any part of the text, explicitly referencing the fact that the text in subject or language elicits amusement on the part of the reader.

CACO: 2.2.3 -- I thought it was kind of funny.

PAGI: 1.4.9 -- Cause it wasn't that much funny and xxx it ain't funny .

JECL: 1.1.3 -- And I tried to make it kind of funny because most worms don't eat saurkraut and rotten banana pudding, and ...

ACTION (excitement, suspense, plot) -- The student comments on the whole or any part of the text, either explicitly referencing action, excitement, and suspense in the text or describing a corresponding reader reaction. May be combined with comments on the plot or story of the text (e.g., The plot was exciting.)

Generalized comments limited to plot itself (e.g., This was a good plot.) would be categorized under LITERARY FEATURES.

CHBR: 1.1.1 -- cause I think it is neat and very exciting.

JECL: 2.1.2 -- OK she says that she saved his, his life and when they went they saw this terrible snake right in front of em you know and it seems to make you think, "oh no, what happened?" and that makes you want to read on.

CHARACTERIZATION -- The student's comments focus on any quality of the characters in the text that attract reader interest. The student does more than state that the characters are well presented and focuses on more than who the characters are (see LITERARY FEATURES). Rather, comments focus on how these characters are presented. (e.g., The boy seemed real.)

VEDA: 2.1.3 -- I think this was the best one because its puttin people that she loved in her story.

ROGU: 1.4.11 -- Cuz see um superman. Wha - what I li- picked this for. Superman has um got mean y'know and ... xxxx got mean he changed and that's why I got it the last one.

STYLE -- The student comments on the interest level created by any aspect of writing style (e.g., voice, imagery, and expression) not included in the subcategories described above.

WEKI: 2.2.3 -- Um... Cuz it's...it's I like the way um it was wrote. I like it better than the others.

WEKI: 2.2.4 -- The expressions um xxxx the way it said um Help Help and chopped its head right off.

WEKI: 2.2.5 -- Cuz um she took the hoe and chopped its head right off. I like the way he said that.

JWFA: 2.1.3 -- Um, I liked the way she described the things like the pillow of the chair felt like a big fluffy cloud and um... she talked about the light bulb was a coconut and all.

OTHER -- Other comments describing specific features that create interest that are not included in the categories described above (e.g., point of view, juxtaposition, stupidity, and redundance)

REALITY -- The student focuses on whether or not the text is true, believable, or a fantasy.

GENERAL -- The student does not give enough specific information about the kind of reality to permit subcategorization (e.g., It's not real.)

HUKA: 2.2.3 -- Um, it says she saved my life I am sure thats not really true that she saved my life and its just kind of exaggerating it but um the fact that she says that her grandma is the greatest its kind of like she is saying that she lives her grandma very very much and um I like that you know.

CREDIBILITY -- The student refers to the believability of the text - whether the text could or couldn't happen or seems like it could or couldn't happen. Category includes students' citing believability or supernatural fantasy. It is differentiated from REAL LIFE in that CREDIBILITY refers to how well done the text is, rather than in whether it represents what actually happened. (e.g., It sounds like a true story.)

CHCH: 2.1.4 -- snakes don't do... (pause) like the only thing that is wrong in here is that the snake walks. Snakes don't walk that is the only thing about it.

ROGU: 2.4.8 -- Cuz see he he's kind of a liar. And that he's like pretending he's buying furniture and all and his mother called him and and he sometimes have to obey his mother and father and older brother and and his mother's going to buy a table and he didn't he didn't want a table he wanted him a um um um um bedroom set for his room. And I don't think I just think he's telling a lie and doing different things.

REAL LIFE -- The student refers to whether or not events described in the text actually did occur. This category implies knowledge from personal experiences rather than believability (e.g., This really did happen; I just made that up, it didn't really happen).

SHHA: 1.2.6 -- Um. (pause) Cuz um it's true. And it tells the story of what happened to my dog and everything.

ROOL: 1.1.1 -- Cause I do have a dog that can give you paw and he do play foot ball with me ...

OTHER -- The student refers to an aspect of reality not included above.

IDENTIFICATION -- The student's comments imply recognition of personal similarity (or dissimilarity) with character(s), situation(s) or event(s) described in the text (e.g., I sometimes feel like that boy in the story; I can't picture myself in that situation.) In these comments, the student refers explicitly to elements in the text which distinguishes this category from the categories of TOPIC (where comments refer just to the topic) and ASSOCIATION (where comments are irrelevant or only loosely connected to the text.))

JECL: 2.1.3. -- ...it makes you think "Wow, I wish I had a grandma like that"

AMJE: 2.1.2. -- I'd probably do the same thing. I wouldn't stand there watching the snake's head.

AMJE: 2.3.6. -- I do the same thing when my momma goes shopping. I do the same thing. I sit there and act like I can buy everything (laugh)'n I would like to have a crazy lamp too.

LITERARY FEATURES -- The student refers to the following types of or features of literature without giving reasons for the choice. There is no explanation or elaboration about the choice that is made except that it is a particular literary type or feature.

PLOT -- The student comments on the main plan of events and/or action in literary fiction, including remarks specifically denoting such aspects as: beginning, middle and end or story line (e.g., The story had a good ending; These events made a good plot.)

HEEN 2.2.5. -- ...It didn't have much of an ending.

HEEN 1.2.5 -- ... It's just, I thought it was good because of the story.

CHARACTERS -- The student's remarks are directed to the personae (people, animals) in the text. Reference is only to that character and not to the personality traits, the features or action of that individual (see CHARACTERIZATION under FEATURES TO CREATE INTEREST) (e.g., I liked the dog in that story; I didn't like that story because of the kids in it.)

JOMY: 2.2.3 -- It has this little girl that is talking.

BUQU: 2.1.1 -- Because he's telling about him and his grandma.

FORMS/GENRES -- The student comments on the similarity (or dissimilarity) of the text to literary genres (i.e., short stories) or commonly recognized types of writing (i.e., Christmas story, letters of persuasion) (e.g., It's like an adventure story; I tried to write a mystery.)

BEBR 1.3.8 -- It kinda took after a ... nursery rhyme or story.

JOMY 2.3.8. -- It's kind of like an adventure.

JUWA: 1.3.8 -- ... It's persuasive. It is a persuasive letter, that is mainly why I did it

HUKA: 1.4.8 -- ... This is supposed to be a news article (and) these are creative things that are not news.

MATCHES REQUIREMENT -- The student recognizes features of writing as dictated by an assignment and evaluates how the text conforms to these requirements (e.g., The assignment said to start with "once upon a time"; It was just like the teacher said to do.)

OTHER -- The student mentions other features of a specific genre such as rhyming, elements of persuasion or standard form phrases (e.g, in conclusion; long,long ago).

LANGUAGE FEATURES -- The student refers to words, sentences or other linguistic features without giving the detail and or reasons required for FEATURES THAT CREATE INTEREST or MAKES SENSE categories.

WORD CHOICE -- The student simply refers to words positively or negatively but does not explain why that word is important to them. There is no description or detailing of the word or word type. The reference is general. (If the student describes the word type or gives a reason for an evaluation than the item would be categorized under INFORMATION or FEATURES TO CREATE INTEREST.) (e.g., That's my favorite word; He didn't use good words)

TEBR: 1.4.6. -- Because...this story didn't have...that much good words in it.

ROGU: 2.1.3. -- It's got a lot of ... it's got my favorite word in here.

SHHA: 1.4.8. -- 'Cuz a bunch of my words aren't right.

SENTENCES AND PARAGRAPHS -- The student refers to sentences and paragraphs positively or negatively without referring to their details or interesting features. General comments about length and structure are given (e.g., It had a complex sentence; The last paragraph had too many "ands" in it.)

JUWA: 1.3.9. -- And these sentences were too long. So that's why...why I put it third.

JUWA: 2.4.10. -- but, ah...these sentences were too short, I think (uh)...that is why I put it last.

OTHER -- The student refers to some linguistic feature of the text other than those specified.

ASSOCIATION

The student evaluates the text based on events and ideas from his own experiences which are suggested by or loosely related to part of the content of the text. The student does not recall events

or ideas which are almost identical to events described in the text (see REPEATS PARTS and IDENTIFICATION), but instead refers to events and ideas which are different from those in the text.

GENERAL -- use when it is not possible to distinguish between subcategories.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCE -- The student refers to events/happenings in his or her own life or in the life of family and friends that are suggested by or loosely related to content of text.

> JAJO: 1.1.1. -- Cause I love my dog. And...I like to help my dog and he likes to help me. Cuz, uh, he almost stepped on a rattlesnake. He went and jumped XXX and grabbed it ...He live on a farm. (None of the events mentioned appear in the text.)
>
> ROGU: 1.1.4 -- I had bought him a bike for giving me all the pennies and my mom has been saving them up for money ... And she's been paying for them and then when we get out of school we can go play more often with each other. (None of the events mentioned appear in the text.)

NON PERSONAL EVENTS -- The student refers to events or people that he or she has heard about or has read about (for example, books, TV shows, movies, historical incidents) which are suggested by or loosely related to the content of the text.

> PAGI: 1.4.10. -- (Comments based on a book report on James and the Giant Peach) When he saw in the...but I ain't, I ain't put this in the story, but when he saw...the white thing come XXX like monsters and all like clouds, cloud men and stuff, they have a rainbow...

OTHER -- The student mentions other subjects suggested by the text, but not listed above.

PROCESS

The student evaluates the text based on references to the processes of creating and sharing/publishing the text rather than refering to qualities of or parts of the text itself. If a student includes both a reference to processes and to a characteristic of the text such as INFORMATION or FEATURES TO CREATE INTEREST, the comment should be categorized as PROCESS.

GENERAL -- The student's statement, although clearly process related, is so general or vague that it cannot be categorized into one of the categories given below.

EFFORT -- The student refers to the amount of difficulty or ease demanded by the task of writing or to the time taken to create the text, including reference to the topic's being easy or difficult to write about (e.g, That one was hard to write; I didn't take much time to write that one.)

JUWA: 1.4.11. -- ...I just kind of threw it down so that's why I put it last.

JAJO: 1.3.4 -- 'Cause it was hard. It was hardest.

AUDIENCE REACTION -- The student refers to an actual or projected audience response to the text, such as persons who are interested, impressed, convinced, or who engaged in some action as a result of reading the text (also, of course, negative reactions). (e.g. I read it to Suzanne, and she just said "ho hum".)

HUKA: 1.1.2. -- I guess because the class liked it.

LAJE: 1.1.2 -- its nice ... that I convinced her and ... (a successful outcome of a persuasive letter asking to be let out of math class for a baseball game.)

STEPS IN PROCESS -- The student refers explicitly to steps in the process of creating and sharing/publishing the text such as selecting the topic, prewriting or rehearsing the topic, writing drafts, revising drafts, proofreading, copying over, reading to an audience, binding in a book or displaying the finished piece of writing. The student may refer to the actual or inferred stages in the piece of writing or compare the actual piece of writing to a projected stage of writing.

JWFA: 1.2.7. -- I pretty much wrote it down the way it is but I put in two, some more drafts ... and stuff to see if that was the best.

TAWI: 1.1.1. -- I had a mouse and I brought it to school and everyone played with it. Then it was my turn to take it home, and Ms.------- told us we had to write a mystery so I decided I would write it on my mouse.

SELF AS WRITER -- The student refers to his or her own thoughts about himself as a writer, his development as a writer, his past experiences as a writer, or his personal ambitions or satisfactions as a writer (e.g., I was only learning how to do letters. I can do better now.) The statement must be more specific than "I did a good job." which is categorized as TEXT GENERAL.

BEBR: 1.3.9. -- ...sometimes I like to go far out and make up weird things and that's what this person did.

JECL: 1.2.4 -- Well because I'm not a big poem writer, and when I do I'm usually proud of them...

OTHER -- The student refers to dimensions of creating and sharing/publishing a text which are not categorized above.

SURFACE QUALITIES

The student refers to mechanics, spelling, or another aspect of text that refers to its image on the paper or to its linguistic correctness rather than to the meaning expressed. The child's reference to words, sentences, and other language features by name without other explanation is categorized under LANGUAGE FEATURES.

GENERAL -- The student doesn't give sufficient information on the surface qualities to categorize further (e.g., It looks bad; It just looks great.)

WEKI: 1.4.3 -- Well, I made a lot of xxx (obvious) mistakes in that one. I didn't really make very many mistakes in Science Fair.

NEATNESS -- The student refers to the overall appearance of the text or to a specific part as being neat or messy or slovenly. If the student refers specifically to handwriting, the statement is categorized under HANDWRITING (e.g, This paper is very neat; My dog chewed on this paper; I spilled on this paper.)

SHHA: 1.1.2 -- And it's neat and everything to me it is.

SPACING, placement, arrangement -- The student refers to how the page is organized, how the writing is placed on the page, or to the margins. (e.g. "The margins are too small." "I like the way I made the writing in the shape of a pumpkin.")

HANDWRITING -- The student refers to the quality of handwriting; neat or messy handwriting goes here rather than under NEATNESS. This category includes legibility (readability or decipherability of handwriting) and artistry (the extent to which the handwriting is pretty or especially embellished.)

HEEN: 1.2.4 -- and there was just (long pause) that part right there I got it all mixed up there and it was hard for me to read because I got all mixed up.

CHCH: 1.4.7 -- I can't read some of my writing (laughs)(pause). ...It is ... it is okay but I don't like the way it is. I can't read some of my own writing.

MECHANICS -- The student refers to spelling, punctuation, or capitalization.

ROGU: 2.2.6 -- and it got periods. It got quotation marks

SHHA: 1.1.3 -- and it got some of the words spelled right.

USAGE (standard written English) -- The student refers to the correctness of word usage, form, or grammar (e.g, You aren't supposed to use the word "ain't".)

LENGTH -- The student refers to whether the piece of writing is of the correct or desired length or too long or too short.

TAWI: 1.4.8 -- and it is the shortest one I have

VEDA: 1.4.4 -- and it was supposed to be a page, 1 page and a half a page but I didn't write that much.

ART WORK -- The student refers to artistic embellishments not part of text or handwriting, such as illustrations or borders.

HUKA: 1.2.5 -- Oh its in my other writing folder um I drew a picture of the little martian and I cut it out. He had two little diddly boppers right up here and he had a little mohawk and he had orange polka dots and he had a knife in his head.

OTHER -- The student refers to a surface feature that is not included on this list.

VALENCE - All statements are classifed as being either positive, negative, mixed or neutral evalauations of the piece of writing.

POSITIVE VALENCE - The child's statement represents a positive evaluation (e.g. I like school.)

> AMJE: 1.2.7 -- Well, we had to read em in front of the class and I didn't mess up, (laughs) because I usually get stuck on a word or two.

NEGATIVE VALENCE - The child's statement is negative (e.g., It's too short; You can't read the words.)

> BEBR: 1.4.12 -- and kinda that's stupid to know about the school (uh huh) about the school being repainted.

NEUTRAL VALENCE - The child's statement is neither positive nor negative (e.g., it's about horses.)

> JAJO: 2.2.3 -- 'Cause that's what I do. That's about all.

MIXED VALENCE - The child gives both positive and negative evaluations in the same statement.

> BEBR: 1.4.10 -- I liked, I liked this one but I didn't feel it was the best writing I've ever done.

PROBES - Interviewer questions or prompts that follow the student's first response are categorized as follows:

PROBE - When the interviewer asks the student to expand upon or add to the explanation of why he/she ranked the text as he/she did. (e.g. Is there anything else about that one that made it number #2?)

SPECIFIC PROBE - When the interviewer refers to a statement the student has made when asking the student to explain the criterion futher (e.g. Could you tell me a little more about why it was "better than the others"?)

LEADING PROBE - When the interviewer attempts to lead the student in a different direction by questioning him/her about an aspect the student has not mentioned. (e.g. You've been telling me what makes it good, but you put it last. Can you tell me why you put it as #4 or you've told me parts of the story, but can you say anything about the words were bad?)

NO RESPONSE PROBE - An interviewer probe followed by a student shaking his/her head no, says no, or otherwise declining to discuss his/her criteria further.

DITTO - A ditto is used when a probe elicits a criteria that is substantially the same (categorized identically) as the prior response. It is used to distinguish when identical responses appear to be an artifact of the interviewer's probing.